

Q. What is the date?—A. 26th July, 1916.

Q. That was directed to you?—A. Yes.

Q. And pursuant to that, you did give the necessary authority for the transfer of the security deposit by signing in the book you referred to, which is not here?—A. Well, I concurred in it.

Q. You concurred in it, I am adopting your own language, in using the word authorization. Are we to assume then that when you did concur or authorize that transfer you were satisfied?—A. Yes, I had all the explanation I had asked for.

Q. I did not ask you that. Were you satisfied?—A. I was satisfied.

By Mr. Bennett (Simcoe):

Q. Have you any objection to telling the Committee, Mr. Fraser, who informed you that the vessel has been sold afterwards to the Russian Government at a price above the contract price agreed upon with the Dominion Government?—A. Yes, that was confidential.

Q. Was it anybody in the Department?—A. No.

Q. Was it a representative of the Russian Government, or a representative of Vickers? Can you go that far?—A. It was not a representative of either of those.

Q. Was it in any way directly or indirectly connected with either of those, either the Government of Russia?—A. No.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. Or of Vickers Maxim?—A. No.

By Mr. Blain:

Q. Did you find out at the time of the sale to the Russian Government—you did find out the terms of the contract if there was any contract, with the Russian Government before you authorized the release?—A. No, that was all the information that I had.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. I take it this information, whatever it may be, was obtained since August 28th, 1914?—A. Yes.

Q. And since September 1st, 1916.

By Mr. Bennett (Simcoe):

Q. What is the date of Mr. Johnston's letter to you marked "confidential"?
The CHAIRMAN: September 1st, 1916.

By Mr. Bennett (Simcoe):

Q. In view of the fact that the Department specifically said through the Deputy in that letter that they did not intend to assign the contract, would it not have been fair to ask the Department if they could not remove this seal of confidence and publish that letter, and let both go into your report, your assumption and their denial?—A. I suppose there would have been no harm.

Q. Did that occur to you, that that would have been to the better interest of all parties concerned, and of the country in particular, that your assumption and their explicit denial should go out together in your report? However, you did not call the attention of the Department to that matter and ask if you might publish the letter?—A. That was the only thought that struck me at the time.

Q. It would be better to have let the whole record go through complete.